UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,779	06/18/2001	Daniel T. Johnson	6740.01	2427

25763　　7590　　01/27/2005		EXAMINER
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP		POINVIL, FRANTZY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT		
50 SOUTH SIXTH STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1498	3628	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9, 11-18, 20-28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Northington et al (US Patent No. 6,128,602).

As per claims 1-9, 11-18, 20-28, 30, 31 and 33-37, Northington et al disclose a system

and method for the real-time consolidation of information from multiple financial systems. In so

doing, Northington et al teach a system for managing a plurality of assets of a plurality of

distributed enterprises and allowing a user to access asset information.   See the abstract.

Northington et al disclose a central processor, a database for storing and tracking asset

information for the plurality of assets of the plurality of enterprises, the database in

communication with the central processor wherein the central processor tracks information

relevant to managing each of the assets. Applicant is directed to figures 1-3 and column 2, line

29 to column 4, line 20.

Northington et al. further teach the central processor includes a website hosted by at least

one computer in communication with a computer network through a communication link, a client

processor. See figures 1-3. The central processor automatically generates E-mail messages to a

service provider in response to a service request by the user. See column 6, lines 23-40. The

client processor inputs, queries and downloads asset information from the central processor

through a web browser. The central processor is programmed with code for utilizing a user

profile, including securable attributes, to limit access to particular asset information. See column

5, lines 35-56 and column 10, lines 14-38 and lines 56-65 of Northington et al. Northington et al

further teach the asset interface communicates with the client processor through a wireless

communication modality. Note column 5, lines 12-15.

Northington et al. also disclose calculating a total cost of ownership for a particular asset

or group of assets by updating all transactions stored in the database. See column 13, lines 7-20

and column 16, lines 7-40.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 19, 29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Northington et al (US Patent No. 6,128,602).

As per claims 10 and 32, Northington et al do not explicitly teach the central processor is

programmed with code for generating a GIS map locating one of the plurality of enterprise

assets. As per this feature, the enterprises or financial systems discussed in Northington et al

may possess a plurality of different types of assets located in different geographic locations.

Using a GIS map for locating assets is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a GIS map for locating

assets if the enterprises own assets such as vehicles or transportation assets so as to be informed

of their location and conditions so as to better assess the total costs or values of all assets owned

by the enterprise.

As per claim 19, Northington et al do not explicitly teach the user is an equipment

manufacturer. The enterprises discussed in Northington et al may deal with a plurality of

financial systems and equipment manufacturers. The user being an equipment manufacturer

does not bring different functions in the system of Northington et al. It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a user being an equipment manufacturer if the system of

Northington et al is dealing with a manufacturer with the motivation to account to all types of

assets and manufacturers of assets as would be desired.

As per claim 29, the client processor being a kiosk located at an enterprise is not

explicitly stated in Northington et al. Northington et al state that client can be any computer

system thus meeting a kiosk.

3.   Claims 38-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dilger, Karen Abramic ("Asset management, maintenance redefined), Manufacturing Systems,

v15n7, pp. 122-128, July 2997, CODEN: MASYES< ISSN: 0748-948X, JRNL CODE: MFS,

Dialog file 15, Accession No. 01493159 and/or McGovern et al (5,918,207).

As per claims 38 and 45, Dilger discusses many asset management systems wherein a

central database stores information on various assets held by an organization. Users of the

organization access a website hosted by at least one server and transmit a service request to the

server. See pages 3-7 of the reference. Thus, Dilger discusses receiving a service request at the

website for an asset. Dilger does not explicitly teach the steps of automatically selecting an

appropriate service provider based on the asset to be serviced and generating an electronic

message to the appropriate service provider requesting the service. The Examiner notes that

such a step would have been obvious to introduce in the system of Dilger in order to

appropriately select a service provider with the proper skill and knowledge capable of servicing

the request, thereby providing a much faster rendering of the needed service.

Alternatively, one of ordinary skill in the art would have turned to the teachings of

McGovern et al for the teachings of the automatic selection of a service provider capable of

fulfilling a service request. See the abstract of McGovern et al. McGovern et al teach a system

and method which automatically select a service worker capable of fulfilling a service request

based on the information obtained from the service request. See column 10, line 52 to column

11, line 41.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to combine the teachings discussed in Dilger with the teachings McGovern et al in order to

devise a method and system for appropriately selecting a service provider with the proper skill

and knowledge capable of servicing a request, thereby providing a much faster rendering of the service request.

As per claim 39, the combined teachings above do not explicitly recite the additional steps of creating a log listing service requests and generating additional electronic messages to the service provider if no response has been forthcoming. Such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do in the combined teachings above to reassert the needs of the desired service requests to the service provider, thereby noting the urgency of the desired service..

As per claim 40, in the combination above, the electronic message is an E-mail.

As per claim 41, the combined teaching above does not explicitly state the additional step of attaching asset information onto the E-mail. Such would have been obvious to do by the ordinary skill in the art to do in the combination above in order to inform the service provider of malfunctions of the asset to be serviced so as to expedite repairs of the asset.

As per claim 42, the combination above does not explicitly teach attaching a link to a web page onto the E-mail. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to attach a link to a web page onto the E-mail in the combined teachings above in order to provide the service with sources where further information regarding the asset may be found so as to expedite repairs of the asset.

As per claims 43 and 44, receiving a service report at the website from the service provider would have been obvious to do in the combination above so as to provide service or repairs made regarding the asset. Storing asset information in the service report under an appropriate factor would have also been obvious to do in the combination above in order to

acknowledge all services made on a particular asset and also to enable easy access and retrieval

of such a record.

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Frantzy Poinvil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9779. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FP
January 21, 2005

FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 3628